

### III. REMARKS

By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended, and claims 8-20 have been canceled. As a result, claims 1-8 remain pending in this application. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the subject matter. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Sturms et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,966 B1), hereafter “Sturms.” Applicant asserts that Sturms does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Sturms fails to teach or suggest providing milestones at predetermined locations in the application within a workflow of the application, the application having a series of executable workflow processes and being loaded on a server, each milestone comprising a checkpoint in the runtime execution of the application. In contrast, the ID fields that the Office equates with the checkpoints of the claimed invention are in a database. To this extent, the ID fields are not in an application that has a series of executable workflow processes. Rather, the application in Sturms that is used to access its database is located on the client. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Sturms also fails to teach or suggest automatically transporting the user to the particular milestone when the user logs into the application following an interruption in execution of the application. Rather, the passages of Sturms cited by the Office indicate that the accessing of the stored IDs occurs within the normal flow of the Sturms processing and not following an interruption in execution of the application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejection.

With respect to dependent claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that Sturms also fails to teach or suggest recording the association of the user with the particular milestone in a persistent storage on the server to preserve the user state. Conversely, Sturms teaches away from this limitation, stating that “...the user’s state within the accessed database can be maintained *without storing any information on the web server.*” Col. 2, lines 46-48, *emphasis added*. To this extent, Sturms does not teach or suggest recording an association of the user with a particular milestone on the server. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejection.

With respect to the Office’s other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Date: June 25, 2008

---

Hunter E. Webb

Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)